DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 587 CS 503 269

AUTHOR Pearson, Judy C.
TITLE A Factor Analytic Study of the Items in the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension and the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 22p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (30th, Acapulco, Mexico, May 18-23, 1980). Parts may not reproduce clearly.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults: *Assertiveness: Communication Problems: *Communication Research: *Factor Analysis: Factor Structure: Higher Education: *Interpersonal Competence: *Rating Scales: *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Apprehension: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension: Rathus Assertiveness Schedule

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to determine the relationship between assertiveness and communication apprehension by examining common factors that exist between the items on the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension. The two instruments were administered to students at a large midwestern university. Responses to the two instruments were submitted to a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. The six factors that emerged were: (1) apprehension about public speaking, (2) apprehension about interpersonal communication, (3) preventing others from taking advantage, (4) candidness, (5) contentiousness, and (6) the making of complaints in restaurants. The first factor came exclusively from the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, the second factor came from both instruments, and the remaining factors came exclusively from the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule. Since the linkage between assertiveness and apprehension about communication as measured by these instruments appears to be the common factor of apprehension about interpersonal communication, the recommendation of assertiveness training for persons suffering from anxiety in interpersonal situations appears valid. (MKM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198587

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A FACTOR ANALYTIC STUDY OF THE ITEMS IN THE PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND THE RATHUS ASSERTIVENESS SCHEDULE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judy C. Pearson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Judy C. Pearson
Department of Speech
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

CS503269

International Communication Association Convention
Acapulco, Mexico
May 1980

Assertiveness is defined in terms of communication and the measurement of assertiveness relies on communication behaviors. The initial definition by Wolpe and Lazarus alludes to communication: "Although the most common class of assertive behaviors involved in therapeutic action is the expression of anger and resentment, the term 'assertive' is used to cover all socially acceptable expressions of personal rights and feelings" (Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966, p. 39). Norton and Warnick (1976) found that the subconstructs of assertiveness that emerged from two assertiveness measures were low anxiety, dominance, contentiousness and a refusal to be intimidated by others. Assertiveness correlated highly with verbal intensity, talkativeness, and good style of communication. Gritzmacher and Tucker (1979) identified self-confidence and positive self-image emerging as major components from three selected assertiveness scales and a similar dimension, confrontation or outsponkenness, common among them. Eisler, Miller and Hersen (1973) identified five behaviorally defined components of assertivness: (1) shorter response latencies, (2) louder speech, (3) greater affect, (4) less compliance, and (5) more requests for changes in the behavior of the interpersonal partner. These components represent specific communication behaviors used by researchers to identify assertive behavior.

Researchers posit a relationship between assertiveness and anxiety. Wolpe (1958, 1973) maintains that assertive responses are incompatible with anxiety. Wolpe and Lazarus (1966) argue that anxiety is partly overcome by self-assertiveness. Morgan (1965) demonstrated an inverse relationship between the Rathus Assertiveness Scale and an index of social fears. Percell (1974) found for women an inverse relationship between assertiveness and anxiety. Gay, Hollandsworth, and Galassi (1975) showed that college students who scored low in assertiveness scored significantly higher on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. Finally, Orenstein, Orenstein, and Carr (1975) demonstrated that assertiveness relates inversely with neuroticism, trait anxiety, and interpersonal anxiety. Nonetheless, in a summary of the major research issues surrounding assertiveness, Galassi and Galassi (1977) included among the difficulties, "The problem of differentiating aggressive behavior from assertive behavior, [and] the relationship between anxiety and assertion" (p. 307).

Assertive training is frequently recommended as a method of reducing anxiety in interpersonal situations (Lazarus, 1966; Wolpe, 1973; Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966). Many alternatives have been suggested for increasing assertiveness, but little attention has been directed toward specifying the relationship between anxiety about communication and assertiveness.

Communication apprehension, the fear or anxiety that an individual associates with real or anticipated oral communication with another person or persons, has been of concern to communication scholars for over four decades. Communication apprehension has been shown to have a negative impact on individual's communication behavior as well as on other essential aspects of their lives (cf. Bashore, 1971; Daly & McCroskey, 1975; Daly & Leth, 1976; Davis, 1977; McCroskey & Anderson, 1976; McCroskey, Daly, Richmond, & Falcione, 1977). Communication apprehension has been shown to be related to anxiety (McCroskey, Daly, & Sorenson, 1976). Furthermore, people who are high communication apprehensives have been shown to be perceived by others to be low in assertiveness and responsiveness (Knutson & Lashbrook, 1976).

The relationship between assertiveness and apprehension about communication has not been systematically examined. Previous research suggests that such a relationship might be posited. This study was undertaken to determine the relationship between assertiveness and apprehension about communication by factor analyzing the items on the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 215 undergraduates enrolled in speech communication courses at a large midwestern university. The number of subjects was determined on the basis of previous factor analyses which suggested that the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule would allow a three or four factor solution and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension would be unidimensional. Generally, about fifty subjects per factor is recommended; although higher factors would allow fewer subjects and lower factors would require a greater number of subjects.

Procedure

The Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (Rathus, 1973) and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (McCroskey, 1970) were administered at the beginning of an academic term.

Measures

The Rathus Assertiveness Schedule measures assertive behaviors or frankness in a variety of business and social settings. It includes 30 items and originally used a six-point Likert scale with 16 reversed items. In this study, the six-point scale was replaced with a five-point scale so items from both instruments could be administered in a single test packet. The author recognized the methodological danger involved in this practice and cautions readers to take this

alteration into account when generalizing from the results of this study. The Rathus scale has a reported test-retest reliability of .78 and a split half reliability of .77 for samples of 68 and 67, respectively. Rathus obtained a validity coefficient of .70 between RAS scores and impartial raters' impressions (Rathus, 1973). Significant differences have been demonstrated before and after assertiveness training.

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension measures an individual's apprehension about oral communication. The PRCA-College includes 20 items and a five-point Likert scale. Reports of internal reliability have all exceeded .90 (cf., McCroskey, 1978). This measure was selected because of its well established predictive validity as well as its high reliability. The validity of the instrument is examined in a recent research report (McCroskey, 1978).

Statistical Analysis

The statistical method used to determine the factor structure of these two scales was a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation (Harman, 1967). The highest correlation in each row was placed in the diagonal. The eigenvalues for the first ten factors before rotation are reported in Table 1. Five through eight factors were

(INSERT TABLE 1 HERE.)

rotated on the basis of the scree test (Cattell, 1966), and

each solution was inspected. Since the seven and eight factor solutions were not interpretable, the six factor solution was adopted. These six factors accounted for 41.7% of the total variance. The criterion used for selecting items to be included in each factor was that the difference in the squares between the primary and secondary loading was .20 or greater.

(INSERT TABLE 2 HERE.)

An orthogonal factor solution is satisfactory when differences between the factors are great, as they were in this solution. Consequently, an oblique factor solution was not computed. However, the true independence of the factors and their substantive meaningfulness was further examined by determining the reliabilities and the correlations among the scores derived from the factors, corrected for attenuation. The reliability coefficients ranged from .79 to .95; the correlations between scales were all low, with the exception of Factor 1 and Factor 2 which had a correlation coefficient of .30. The reliability coefficients that were determined suggest that published reliabilities seem to hold up for this population; the correlation coefficients suggest independence of the factors.

RESULTS

The six factors which emerged from the two instruments are given in Table 2. These factors were labeled and reported below with their salient items:

Factor 1 (F1) Public Speaking, Apprehensive--does not look forward to opportunities to present public speeches and experiences fear when considering such possibilities. Factor I is characterized by the items "look forward to public speaking" (-.72), "face speechmaking with confidence" (-.71), "enjoy presenting t. v. show" (-.71), "enjoy experience of speaking" (-.66), "loss for words on platform" (.65) "avoid public speaking" (.64), "confused thoughts in speaking" (.60), "no fear of audience" (.57), "hands tremble on platform" (.56), and "feel more fluent than others" (-.53).

Factor 2 (F2) Interpersonal Communication, Apprehensive does not look forward to opportunities to communicate with the same sex or opposite sex people in dyads or in small groups and experiences fear when considering such situations. This factor is characterized by the items "tense in group discussions (.66), "nervous in a conversation" (.62), "self-conscious in class" (.62), "hesitated to date because of shyness" (.61), "posture feels strained when communicating" (.53), and "enjoy starting conversations" (-.47).

Factor 3 (F3) Preventing Others from Taking Advantage--asserting one's rights, even in unpleasant situations. Factor 3 is identified by the items "people take advantage of me" (-.64), "when injured, do not hurt other's feelings" (-.50), "during an argument, afraid that I will shake" (-.45), and "difficulty in saying 'no' to salespeople" (-.42).

Factor 4 (F4) Candid--willing to be open and frank about feelings and perceptions. This factor is characterized by two items: "open and frank about feelings" (-.70) and

"talk to someone who has been spreading stories about me" (-.54).

Factor 5 (F5) Contentious--willing to start arguments, volunteer opinions, or to question others. Factor 5 is characterized by the items "I sometimes look for an argument" (-.63), "I state my opinion if I disagree with a lecturer" (-.60), and "I insist upon knowing why I must do something" (-.46).

Factor 6 (F6) Making Complaints in Restaurants--Responding definitively in restaurants. Factor 6 is characterized by the items "I complain about food in a restaurant" (-.63) and "I complain about service in a restaurant" (-.58).

DISCUSSION

The current study extracted a total of six factors from the two scales: one factor came exclusively from the personal report scale, four factors came exclusively from the Rathus scale and one factor overlapped the two scales. Readers are cautioned that the findings of this study must be qualified by the replacement of the six-point scale on the Rathus instrument with a five-point scale. The linkage between assertiveness and apprehension about communication, as measured by these instruments, appears to be the common factor of apprehension about interpersonal communication. The recommendation of assertive training for persons suffering from anxiety in interpersonal situations appears valid.

This study generally confirms the previously established factor structure of the RAS. Norton and Warnick (1976) found four factors: low anxiety, dominance, contentiousness, and a refusal to be intimidated by others. Gritzmacher and Tucker (1979) identified self-confidence, positive self-image, and confrontation or outspokenness. Interpersonal communication apprehension, found in this study, corresponds to Norton and Warnick's low anxiety and Gritmacher and Tucker's self-confidence; Factor 3, preventing others from taking advantage, corresponds to a refusal to be intimidated by others in the Norton and Warnick solution and provides part of the congrontation or outspokenness dimension identified by Gritzmacher and Tucker. Factor 4, candid, is corresponds to a portion of of Norton and Warnick's dominance dimension and to Gritzmacher and Tucker's positive self-image. Factor 5, contentious, was similarly found by Norton and Warnick and is similar to a portion of the confrontation or outspokenness dimension determined by Gritzmacher and Tucker. Finally, Factor 5, making complaints in restaurants, comprises a portion of the Norton and Warnick dominance dimension and a part of the Gritzmacher and Tucker confrontation dimension.

This study does not confirm the previously established unidimensionality of the PRCA. It is not possible to compare teh factor analytic methods of the current study with the original factor analysis of the instrument since the original statistical analysis is only alluded to in a recent research report (McCroskey, 1978), and the factor analysis has apparently

not been reported. This peripheral finding of two factors rather than one emerging from the PRCA does have implications which require a reexamination of two issues relevant to the PRCA. First, the question of stability of the PRCA factor structure must be raised. The population of this study is probably similar to the earlier population: male and female undergraduate students at large state universities who were enrolled in beginning communication courses were used in both cases. One relevant difference may be the time of the two studies: McCroskey (1978) performed his factor analysis in 1972 before interpersonal communication courses had gained widespread acceptance in college curricula and before the differences between the two communication situations, or courses, had gained salience with undergraduate students. In 1979, curricula are replete with interpersonal communication courses and programs, and undergraduates are keenly aware of the differences between courses in public speaking and interpersonal communication. Their increased awareness might have allowed them to distinguish between the two types of apprehension represented in the PRCA.

Second, the utility of administering the PRCA when seeking an exclusive measure of public speaking apprehension or of interpersonal communication apprehension is questioned. The bidimensional nature of the scale clouds its usefulness. A more accurate measure for public speaking apprehension would include only those eleven items

which loaded on Factor 1 and a more appropriate instrument to measure interpersonal communication apprehension would consist exclusively of the six items which loaded on Factor 2.

At the present time, a high score on the PRCA probably indicates apprehension about public speaking and interpersonal communication while a low score most likely indicates little apprehension about these two communication situations. But what does a score between these two extremes indicate? The person may suffer from interpersonal communication apprehension, but not public speaking apprehension; public speaking apprehension, but not interpersonal communication apprehension; or moderate amounts of apprehension toward both situations. The ambiguity indicated by this two factor solution to the PRCA precludes optimum interpretation of the instrument.

The factor structure of the RAS and PRCA was investigated in this study. The results indicated that both instruments are multifactored and that the two instruments share the common factor of interpersonal communication apprehension. Of perhaps greater importance, this study extracted a two factor solution from the PRCA. This peripheral finding should add clarity and precision to this instrument which is regularly used by researchers and teachers.

REFERENCES

BASHORE, D. N. Relationships among speech anxiety, I. Q., and high school achievement. M. S. thesis, Illinois State University, 1971.

CATTELL, R. B. The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1966, I, 245-276.

DALY, J.A. & LETH, S. Communication apprehension and the personnel selection decision. Paper presented to the International Communication Association convention. Portland, Oregon, 1976.

DALY, J.A. & McCROSKEY, J. C. Occupational choice and desirability as a function of communication apprehension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 309-313.

DAVIS, G. F. Communication apprehension, intelligence, and acievement among secondary school students. Unpublished M. A. thesis, West Virginia University, 1977.

EISLER, R. M., MILLER, P. M., & HERSEN, M. Components of assertive behavior. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973, 29, 295-299.

GAY, M. L. HOLLANDSWORTH, J. H., JR. & GALASSI, J. P. An assertiveness inventory for adults. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 340-344.

GRITZMACHER, K. J. & TUCKER, R. K. A multivariate investigation of selected assertiveness instruments. Paper presented to the International Communication Association convention. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,

HARMAN, H. H. Modern factor analysis. (2nd ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

KNUTSON, P. K. & LASHBROOK, W. B. Communication apprehension as an antecedent to social style. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association convention. San Francisco, 1976.

LAZARUS, A. A. Behavior rehearsal vs. non-directive therapy vs. advice in effecting behavior change. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 209-212.

McCROSKEY, J. C. Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 1970, 37, 269-277.

McCROSKEY, J. C. Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 1978, 45, 192-203.

McCROSKEY, J. C. & ANDERSEN, J. F. The relationship between communication apprehension and academic achievement among college students. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 73-81.

McCROSKEY, J. C., DALY, J. A., RICHMOND, V. P. & FALCIONE, R. L. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3, 269-277.

McCROSKEY, J. C., DALY, J. A., & SORENSON, G. A. Personality correlates of communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2, 376-380.

MORGAN, W. G. The relationship between expressed social fears and assertiveness and its treatment implications. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1974, 12, 45-53.

NORTON, R. & WARNICK, B. Assertiveness as a communication construct. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 62-66.

ORENSTEIN, H., ORENSTEIN, E., & CARR, J. E. Assertiveness and anxiety: A correlational study. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 203-207.

PERCELL, L. P. BERWICK, P. T., & BEIGEL, A. The effects of assertive training on self-concept and anxiety. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1974, 31, 502-504.

RATHUS, S. A. A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1973, 4, 398-406.

WOLPE, J. Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958.

WOLPE, J. The practice of behavior therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1973.

WOLPE, J. & LAZARUS, A. A. Behavior therapy techniques. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1966.

TABLE 1

EIGENVALUES FOR FIRST TEN FACTORS

Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor I	9.40
Factor II	3.42
Factor III	2.51
Factor IV	2.04
Factor V	1.88
Factor VI	1.59
Factor VII	1.51
Factor VIII	1.37
Factor IX	1.28
Factor X	1.24

TABLE 2

PRCA AND RAS FACTOR LOADINGS

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
PRCA Items:						
1. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance I feel very nervous	.23	.62	-.15	.11	.09	.17
2. I have no fear of facing an audience.	-.57	-.08	-.00	.10	-.08	-.18
3. I look forward to expressing my opinion at meetings.	-.39	-.24	.10	-.23	-.37	-.05
4. I look forward to an opportunity to speak in public.	-.72	-.11	.03	-.13	-.18	-.08
5. I find the prospect of speaking mildly pleasant.	-.64	-.10	.05	-.27	.05	.00
6. When communicating, my posture feels strained and unnatural.	.19	.53	-.07	.06	-.13	.06
7. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.	.26	.66	-.00	.06	.10	-.01
8. Although I talk fluently with friends I am at a loss for words on the platform.	.65	.19	-.02	-.16	.00	.03
9. My hands tremble when I try to handle objects on the platform.	.56	.12	-.11	-.24	-.01	.06
10. I always avoid speaking in public if possible.	.64	.33	.01	.14	.08	.04
11. I feel that I am more fluent when talking to people than most other people are.	-.53	-.26	-.05	-.27	-.12	-.19
12. I am fearful and tense all the while I am speaking before a group of people.	.56	.40	-.01	-.27	.08	-.09

TABLE 2

PRCA AND RAS FACTOR LOADINGS (CONTINUED)

Item		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
13.	My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I speak before an audience.	.60	.27	-.10	-.06	-.01	-.10
14.	Although I am nervous just before getting up, I soon forget my fears and enjoy the experience.	-.66	-.06	-.02	-.01	..02	.15
15.	Conversing with people who hold positions of authority causes me to be fearful and tense.	.13	.49	-.34	-.17	.12	.13
16.	I dislike to use my body and voice expressively.	.37	.19	-.15	.43	-.05	.11
17.	I feel relaxed and comfortable while speaking.	-.59	-.40	.03	-.21	.09	-.14
18.	I feel self-conscious when I am called upon to answer a question or give an opinion in class.	.21	.62	-.17	-.05	.10	.03
19.	I face the prospect of making a speech with complete confidence.	-.71	.11	.01	-.13	-.09	-.20
20.	I would enjoy presenting a speech on a local television show.	-.71	.05	.07	-.17	-.10	-.03
	RAS Items:						
21.	Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am.	.22	.38	-.18	.16	.40	.13
22.	I have hesitated to make or accept dates because of "shyness."	-.04	.61	.16	.33	-.12	.16

TABLE 2

PRCA AND RAS FACTOR LOADINGS (CONTINUED)

Item		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
23.	When the food served at a restaurant is not done to my satisfaction, I complain about it to the waiter or waitress.	.02	-.13	-.04	-.15	-.16	-.63
24.	I am careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings, even when I feel that I have been injured.	.04	-.05	-.50	.18	.14	-.11
25.	If a salesperson has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise which is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time in saying "No."	.18	.19	-.42	.02	-.04	.17
26.	When I am asked to do something, I insist upon knowing why.	.01	.02	-.00	-.06	-.46	-.08
27.	There are times when I look for a good, vigorous argument.	-.04	-.03	.00	.06	-.63	.05
28.	I strive to get ahead as well as most people in my position.	-.08	-.17	-.07	.08	-.01	-.33
29.	To be honest, people often take advantage of me.	.07	-.03	-.64	.03	-.05	.08
30.	I enjoy starting conversations with new acquaintances and strangers.	-.20	-.47	-.10	-.31	-.20	-.02
31.	I often don't know what to say to attractive persons of the opposite sex.	.10	.48	-.18	.08	-.07	.17
32.	I will hesitate to make phone calls to business establishments and institutions.	.13	.34	-.20	-.07	-.01	.41

TABLE 2

PRCA AND RAS FACTOR LOADINGS (CONTINUED)

Item	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
33. I would rather apply for a job or for admission to a college by writing letters than by going through with personal interviews.	.34	.19	-.19	-.01	.11	.33
34. I find it embarrassing to return merchandise.	-.10	.33	-.18	.14	-.17	.40
35. If a close and respected relative were annoying me, I would smother my feelings rather than express my annoyance.	-.23	.07	-.41	.20	.15	-.03
36. I have avoided asking questions for fear of sounding stupid.	.06	.37	-.45	.10	.16	.08
37. During an argument I am sometimes afraid that I will get so upset that I will shake all over.	.17	.18	-.45	-.20	.09	-.09
38. If a famed and respected lecturer makes a statement which I think is incorrect, I will have the audience hear my point of view as well.	-.13	-.03	.05	-.12	-.60	-.08
39. I avoid arguing over prices with clerks and salespeople.	-.04	-.13	-.29	.14	-.08	.34
40. When I have done something important or worthwhile, I manage to let others know about it.	-.05	.05	-.35	-.31	-.21	-.11
41. I am open and frank about my feelings.	.09	-.26	.16	-.70	-.10	.01

TABLE 2

PRCA AND RAS FACTOR LOADINGS (CONTINUED)

Item		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
42.	If someone has been spreading false and bad stories about me, I see him or her as soon as possible to "have a talk" about it.	-.03	-.06	.06	-.54	-.08	-.19
43.	I often have a hard time saying "No."	.08	.11	-.34	-.16	-.08	.41
44.	I tend to bottle up my emotions rather than make a scene.	.02	.17	-.45	.47	.24	-.05
45.	I complain about poor service in a restaurant and elsewhere.	-.03	.01	-.07	-.25	-.17	-.58
46.	When I am given a compliment, I sometimes just don't know what to say.	.20	.08	-.44	.08	-.23	.20
47.	If a couple near me in a theatre or at a lecture were conversing rather loudly, I would ask them to be quiet or to take their conversation elsewhere.	-.12	-.07	-.08	-.12	-.30	-.44
48.	Anyone attempting to push ahead of me in a line is in for a good battle.	.02	.11	.23	.04	-.48	-.35
49.	I am quick to express an opinion.	-.20	-.35	.17	-.41	-.48	.12
50.	There are times when I just can't say anything.	.04	.33	-.42	.08	.15	-.02
	Total % of variance	12.35	8.75	5.80	5.15	4.84	4.78